



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/774,666	02/09/2004	Brett Curry	5001-0435-1	9432

7590 11/22/2005

Kevin H. Vanderleeden, Esq.
McCormick, Paulding & Huber LLP
CityPlace II
185 Asylum Street
Hartford, CT 06103

EXAMINER

KLEIN, GABRIEL J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3641

DATE MAILED: 11/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/774,666	Applicant(s) CURRY, BRETT	
	Examiner Gabriel J. Klein	Art Unit 3641	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 7/1/2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “substantially non-continuous concave surface” and the “substantially discontinuous concave surface” must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 10-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 10 recites the limitation "said concave inner surface" in the second to last line of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 2, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Moss et al (116078).

In reference to claims 1 and 10, Moss et al discloses an extractor comprising an extractor plate having a plurality of arms extending radially outward from an inner portion of the plate, said arms forming a concave inner surface between adjacent arms, said inner surface substantially conforming to the profile of a bore of the cylinder; said inner surface having an arc length that is greater than one-half the circumference of a cartridge disposed within the cylinder bores of the revolver, said inner surface contacts the rim of a cartridge (figure 4). Further, said inner surface facilitates the removal of the cartridge from the bore (page 1, column 2, paragraph 2, lines 13 and 14). Further, Moss et al discloses a tubular stem having an end that is mounted to said inner portion of the extractor plate (page 1, column 2, paragraph 1, line 4, and figure 2, element A).

In reference to claims 2 and 11, Moss et al discloses that said inner surface between adjacent arms is a substantially continuous curved concave surface (figure 4).

Further, Moss et al discloses at least one of said arms having a convex end portion (figure 4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moss et al as applied to claims 1 and 10. Moss et al discloses the claimed invention except for a substantially non-continuous/discontinuous concave surface between adjacent arms of said extractor plate. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use such a surface, since Applicant has not disclosed that a substantially non-continuous/discontinuous concave surface between adjacent arms solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with substantially continuous curved concave surfaces between adjacent arms.

Claims 4 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moss et al in view of Philips (4543741). Moss et al discloses the claimed invention except for the beveled edge on the inner surface between adjacent arms. Philips teaches that it is known to use a beveled edge as the contact point between extractor

Art Unit: 3641

and cartridge as set forth in column 2, line 22, and figures 2 and 3, to engage the cartridge at its peripheral groove or rim. In a manner similar to Applicants, the examiner is considering the bore as starting forward of the extractor. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the extractor as taught by Moss et al, with the beveled edge as taught by Philips, since such a modification would provide the extractor with said beveled edge on said inner surface between adjacent arms to engage the cartridge at its peripheral groove or rim.

Claims 5 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moss et al in view of Philips and further in view of *In re Boesch*. Moss et al in view of Philips discloses the claimed invention except for the beveled edge angle of about 60 degrees relative to the central axis of the cylinder of the revolver. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an angle of about 60 degrees for that of the beveled edge to engage the rim of the cartridge (which inherently has a similar angle), since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Claims 6, 15, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moss et al in view of Mochak (5218148). Moss et al discloses the claimed invention except for the abutment of the end portion of the extractor arms with the inner surface of the cylinder. Mochak teaches that it is known to use an abutment between the end portion of the extractor arms and the inner surface of the cylinder as set forth in column 2, last paragraph, to minimize rotational or angular movement of the extractor

plate relative to the bores. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the extractor as taught by Moss et al, with the abutment of the end portion of the arms with the inner surface of the cylinder as taught by Mochak, since such a modification would provide the extractor with the abutment of the end portion of the extractor arms with the inner surface of the cylinder to minimize rotational or angular movement of the extractor plate relative to the bores.

Claims 7 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moss et al in view of Mochak as applied to claims 6, 15, and 20. Moss et al in view of Mochak discloses the claimed invention but does not disclose expressly the end portions of the extractor arms having a concave surface. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the extractor as taught by Moss et al in view of Mochak with said end portions of the extractor arms having a concave surface, because Applicant has not disclosed that said end portions of the extractor arms having a concave surface provide an advantage, are used for a particular purpose, or solve a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with end portions of the extractor arms having rectilinear surfaces as taught by Moss et al in view of Mochak, because they minimize rotational or angular movement of the extractor plate relative to the bores, and since it appears to be an arbitrary design consideration which fails to patentably distinguish over Moss et al in view of Mochak.

Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Moss et al in view of Mochak to obtain the invention as specified in the claims.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mochak in view of Philips. Mochak discloses the claimed invention except for the except for the beveled edge on the inner surface between adjacent arms. Philips teaches that it is known to use a beveled edge as the contact point between extractor and cartridge as set forth in column 2, line 22, and figures 2 and 3, to engage the cartridge at its peripheral groove or rim. In a manner similar to Applicants, the examiner is considering the bore as starting forward of the extractor. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the extractor as taught by Mochak, with the beveled edge as taught by Philips, since such a modification would provide the extractor with said beveled edge on said inner surface between adjacent arms to engage the cartridge at its peripheral groove or rim.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mochak in view of Philips and further in view of *In re Boesch*. Mochak in view of Philips discloses the claimed invention except for the beveled edge angle of about 60 degrees relative to the central axis of the cylinder of the revolver. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an angle of about 60 degrees for that of the beveled edge, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moss et al in view of Philips in view of Mochak and further in view of *In re Boesch*.

Moss et al in view of Philips, as applied to claim 8, discloses the claimed invention except for the abutment of the end portion of the extractor arms with the inner surface of the cylinder and the beveled edge angle of about 60 degrees relative to the central axis of the cylinder of the revolver.

Mochak teaches that it is known to use an abutment between the end portion of the extractor arms and the inner surface of the cylinder as set forth in column 2, last paragraph, to minimize rotational or angular movement of the extractor plate relative to the bores. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the extractor as taught by Moss et al in view of Philips, with the abutment of the end portion of the arms with the inner surface of the cylinder as taught by Mochak, since such a modification would provide the extractor with the abutment of the end portion of the extractor arms with the inner surface of the cylinder to minimize rotational or angular movement of the extractor plate relative to the bores.

Further, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an angle of about 60 degrees for that of the beveled edge, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moss et al in view of Philips in view of Mochak in view of *In re Boesch* as applied to claims 17 and 18. Moss et al in view of Philips in view of Mochak in view of *In re Boesch* discloses

Art Unit: 3641

the claimed invention except for a substantially non-continuous/discontinuous concave surface between adjacent arms of said extractor plate. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use such a surface, since Applicant has not disclosed that a substantially non-continuous/discontinuous concave surface between adjacent arms solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with substantially continuous curved concave surfaces between adjacent arms.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gabriel J. Klein whose telephone number is 571-272-8229. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:15 am to 3:45 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Carone can be reached on 571-272-6873. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



MICHAEL J. CARONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER